REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed July 22, 2009.

I.   Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed July 22, 2009, Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-12, 14, 16, 18-21, 23, 24, 26, 28-33, 35, 37-42, 44, 45, 47 and 49-51 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 11 were reject under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-12, 14, 16, 18-21, 23, 24, 26, 28-33, 35, 37-42, 44, 45, 47 and 49-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nusbaum et al. "WebSphere Application Servers: Standard and Advanced Editions," IBM Corporation, IBM Redbooks, First Edition, July 1999 (hereinafter WebSphere).

II.   Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-10, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28-30, 42, 44-45, 47 and 49-51; and cancels Claims 11-12, 14, 16, 18-20, 31-33, 35, 37-41, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-10, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28-30, 42, 44, 45, 47 and 49-51.

III.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Office Action, Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 has been amended to comply with the statutory requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claim 11 has been cancelled. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-12, 14, 16, 18-21, 23, 24, 26, 28-33, 35, 37-42, 44, 45, 47 and 49-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nusbaum et al., "WebShere Application Servers: Standard and Advanced Editions", IBM Corporation, IBM Redbooks, First Edition, July 1999.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

1. (Currently Amended):   *A computer-based system for a distributed web application, comprising:*

     a page flow model that controls behavior of the distributed web application;

     one or more page groups, wherein each page group is a set of related and interacting web application files, wherein each page group contains control logic that implements navigation decisions using one or more action methods, wherein each action method is a method that contains an action annotation,

     wherein at least one said action method in a page group contains a forward annotation that indicates a name of a web application file within the page group, wherein the action method returns a forward object that indicates to the page flow model the web application file the action method wants to navigate to, and wherein the forward object is constructed based on the forward annotation.

Nusbaum discloses utilizing a servlet engine for running Java Servlets. The servlet engine processes the dynamic content and provides for servlet management and supports Java server pages (Page 5, sections 1.3.2, Servlets).

However, there is no indication in Nusbaum that at least one action method in a page group contains a forward annotation that indicates a name of a web application file within the page group, wherein the action method returns a forward object that indicates to the page flow model the web application file the action method wants to navigate to, and wherein the forward object is constructed based on the forward annotation. Here, an action method is a method within a page group that contains an action annotation.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Nusbaum. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 21 and 42

The comments provided above with regard to Claim 1 are herein incorporated by reference. Claims 21 and 42 have been amended similarly to Claim 1. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 21 and 42, as amended, are

likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited reference. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-4, 6, 8-10, 23, 24, 26, 28-30, 44, 45, 47, and 49-51

Claims 3-4, 6, 8-10, 23, 24, 26, 28-30, 44, 45, 47, and 49-51 depend from and include all of the features of Claim 1, 21, or 42. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 22, 2009   By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
                                          Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                          Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No. 80548
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800